



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/609,001	06/28/2000	LISA HEILBRON	1018.091US1	1308

7590 10/03/2003

MICHALIK & WYLIE, PLLC
PMB 193
704 228th AVE NE
SAMMAMISH, WA 98074

EXAMINER

DUONG, THOMAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

(Remain)

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/609,001	06/28/2000	LISA HEILBRON	1018.091US1	1308

7590 09/05/2003

MICHALIK & WYLIE, PLLC
14645 BEL-RED ROAD
SUITE 103
BELLEVUE, WA 98007

EXAMINER

DUONG, THOMAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/609,001

Applicant(s)

HEILBRON ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas Duong

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 13-15, 22-23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Katinsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,609 B1).

2. With regard to *claims 1, 13, 22 and 25*, Katinsky reference discloses,
 - *fetching content for a current web page, the content including one or more links, each link pointing to a web page* (figure 1, sheet 1).
 - *fetching information regarding the web page to which each link points, wherein the information is stored separately from the current web page* (figure 10, sheet 11).
 - *displaying the content for the current web page* (figure 1, sheet 1).

- *displaying an informational region, in response to a cursor hovering over a particular link of the one or more links, the region including the information previously fetched (column 5, lines 28-34).*
3. With regard to *claims 2, 14 and 23*, Katinsky reference discloses,
- *wherein displaying the informational region comprises displaying the informational region by the link (column 5, lines 28-34).*
4. With regard to *claims 3 and 15*, Katinsky reference discloses,
- *wherein the method is such that a user is able to retrieve the information regarding the web page without selecting the link and committing to downloading the web page (column 5, lines 28-34).*
5. With regard to *claim 4*, Katinsky reference discloses,
- *wherein the informational region comprises a text box apparently floating near the link (column 5, lines 28-34; figure 5, sheet 5).*
6. With regard to *claim 5*, Katinsky reference discloses,
- *wherein the information regarding the web page includes at least one of: keywords of the web page; paragraph headings of the web page; links on the web page to other web pages (column 11, lines 17-23).*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the

Art Unit: 2143

subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katinsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,609 B1) and further in view of Weinberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,962).

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katinsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,609 B1) and further in view of Mogul (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,292).

Claims 16-21, 12 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katinsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,609 B1) and further in view of Freund (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,769).

8. With regard to *claims 6-7*, Katinsky reference discloses,

- *the method of claim 1* (see above). However, Katinsky reference does not explicitly disclose,
- *wherein the information regarding the web page includes at least information based on a user's relationship to the web page*

Weinberg teaches,

- *wherein the information regarding the web page includes at least information based on a user's relationship to the web page* (figure 22, sheet 22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Weinberg with Katinsky to facilitate the visualization by the user of the overall architecture of the web site and allow the user to navigate the map in an intuitive manner to explore the content of the web site.

9. With regard to *claims 8-11*, Katinsky reference discloses,

- *the method of claim 1* (see above). However, Katinsky reference does not explicitly disclose,
- *wherein the information regarding the web page includes at least information based on a user relative to the web page.*

Mogul teaches,

- *wherein the information regarding the web page includes at least information based on a user relative to the web page* (figure 2, sheet 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Mogul with Katinsky to improve the perceived latency by predicting and anticipating the next web page based on previous history before the user requests it.

10. With regard to *claims 16-21, 12 and 24*, Katinsky reference discloses,
- *the medium claim of claim 13* (see above rejection in claim 1). However, Katinsky reference does not explicitly disclose,
 - *wherein fetching the information regarding the web page to which each link points comprises retrieving the information from a local cache in which the information is stored.*

Freund teaches,

- *wherein fetching the information regarding the web page to which each link points comprises retrieving the information from a local cache in which the information is stored* (figure 3, sheet 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Freund with Katinsky to reduce the amount of network traffic and also the length of time that a user must wait for the web page to be displayed.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:
- Cartsonis et al. (U.S Patent No. 6,584,501 B1)
 - Wolfe et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,151,603 B1)
12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Duong whose telephone number is


703/305-1886. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703/308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703/305-3719 for regular communications and 703/305-3719 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703/305-3900.

Thomas Duong
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

August 18, 2003



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100